

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. XI, No. 4

MARCH 19, 1951

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

The National Council of the Churches

WITH a carefully thought-out plan of organization and with movingly impressive ceremony, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America was launched at Cleveland. Its establishment registered a stride forward in interdenominational relations and a further advance toward the unification of the work of the Protestants and Eastern Orthodox Churches in the United States. No one who participated in the Cleveland meetings is likely to forget them. They commanded wide publicity and gave the work of the churches a push ahead in our bewildered world.

But as yet this step forward has hardly been noticed in the congregations throughout our land. A Methodist minister in a New England town where there are three churches—Congregational, Episcopal and his own—said recently, "What does this new organization mean on our level in this township?" The women have supplied a practical answer when on the Day of Prayer they held a hearty union service, and came away feeling that God's Spirit was upon them. But we still lack enough things which the churches combine in doing to bring the unity expressed in the National Council down into the hearts and minds of their people.

Can our leaders attempt corporate actions? We must put the fact of the National Council as a "going concern" constantly within the horizon of all congregations. For example, could the churches in the Council pool their educational materials and issue a curriculum with appropriate helps which might bear the name of the National Council rather than that of some particular denomination? If the Bible is the chief source of educational material in all these churches, it would not seem impossible to set forth such a curriculum with helps. Already the new curriculum published for Presbyterians is being used in many churches of other communions. No doubt the helps would need to stress matters which seem important to particular denominations, but these certainly will occupy but a very small portion of their contents. To have all Sunday School and

Bible Class students furnished with printed matter bearing the name of the united enterprise—"THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A."—will get the fact of our union for work into the minds of the rising generation.

Could not conferences now held under denominational auspices be also broadened to bring in all elements in the community who are represented in this National Council? Such conferences are held as schools of preaching to further Evangelism, or to push the cause of Missions. It seems absurd to continue them as the enterprises of a single communion. No doubt it is easier to plan them on this basis; but at one such school of preaching for Evangelism recently three communions were represented in the speakers, while only ministers of one were recruited as students. If the National Council is to live and work in the churches, such one-church affairs should be abolished, where possible, and replaced by a collective assembly. No doubt the executives may find them more cumbersome to get together, and no doubt some group will stand aloof or offer criticisms; but that occurs even now in assemblies limited to ministers or laymen of the one communion. The additional pains required, the increased resistance to be overcome in some quarters, may seem hindrances; but pooling resources, learning to work together, discovering the similarity of our problems and the identity of our faith and hope and love, above all the augmented response to our needs in God who opens Himself to His children in proportion to their community in waiting upon Him, will more than repay the requisite effort and will bring our common leadership into the consciousness of all our churches.

There is admirable mutual understanding and common planning among the "brass hats" of our Protestant and Eastern Orthodox forces; may we beseech them to do their utmost to promote similar collective effort all the way down the line into the congregations in our cities, towns and small villages?

—H. S. C.

Editorial Notes

THE degradation of the Christian faith has reached a new low level in a document entitled "Credo of Hope—1951" sent out by the National Association of Manufacturers. The document is so revealing that we present it in full:

"We believe that American business can and must save the world.

"We believe that political, social and economic chaos exists because, while we nominally are a Christian nation, we have forsaken Christian philosophy to such an extent that we are now predominately a materialist nation.

"We believe that in every chaos there is the seed of rebuilding and that in this present chaos one of the seeds of rebuilding is the fear in the heart of we materialists that we will lose our material gains.

"We believe that political leaders have demonstrated that they are unable to mount an offensive in an ideological war.

"We believe that in a materialist nation economic forces are the potent forces. We believe that the American business associations are the only groups that can and will put the money on the line to re-sell Christian philosophy to America, and thus smother out communism and other false ideologies. We believe that, except for the federal treasury, the economic power joined by the American business associations is the only force equal to the task of waging and winning a national and international ideological war.

"We believe that any idea, even Christian philosophy, can be sold if backed by a proper sales campaign.

"We believe that the American business organizations are the only agencies that can coordinate and thus make effective all of the movements that are now selling partial or watered-down portions of the Sermon on the Mount.

"We believe that business organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers, The Committee for Economic Development, The Advertising Council, the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Bankers Association, can and must spearhead the effort to wage and win an ideological war.

"We believe that the National Association of Manufacturers, can and should call together the heads of the principal business organizations and organize an Ideological War Council.

"We believe that the Council should call in three outstanding ideological leaders, one Catholic, one Protestant and one Jew and commission them to confer and come forth with a statement of simple truths commonly accepted in a Judeo-Christian civilization.

Those truths should be given to a staff of five top men in the advertising industry of America and those top men should be commissioned to prepare them for sale.

"We believe that then these truths should be sold by all of the modern means of advertising, through all modern means of communication, on a mass production scale.

"We believe that such an ideological offensive can be launched immediately, that it can spread rapidly throughout the nation and can then be extended throughout the world.

"We believe that Almighty God will bless the effort."

Such a document tempts one to despair of American culture. No European or Asian criticism of American life could possibly be as damaging as this self-revelation. It puts its trust in some kind of Christian philosophy, but its hope is that "in this present chaos one of the seeds of rebuilding is the fear in the heart of we(sic) materialists that we will lose our material gains." Perhaps the most perfect bit of self-revelation is contained in the phrase: "We believe that the American business organizations are the only agencies that can coordinate and thus make effective all of the movements that are now selling partial and watered-down portions of the Sermon on the Mount." Someone might write a doctor's dissertation on the role which the Sermon on the Mount plays as a symbol in the vapid idealism which passes for the Christian faith in many parts of America, and which is now to be neatly packaged and "sold" by salesmen and advertisers. What kind of blindness or perversity prompts this vapid idealism to choose, of all symbols, the Sermon on the Mount, with its exacting moral demands, all of them straining at the limits of human possibilities? What will the "Ideological War Council" do with the words "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt"? And how will they, in their great selling campaign, make use of the words "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction."—R. N.

Authors in This Issue

We are publishing herewith the statement of Professor Hromadka on the international situation. As is well known, Professor Hromadka, who has been very prominent in Ecumenical affairs, has cast his lot with the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia, and this article is an interesting revelation of the presuppositions which governed his judgments. It is difficult to say how many Protestant Christians in Czechoslovakia agree with Professor Hromadka, though it is clear that he speaks only for a section of the Czech Church.

Robert E. Fitch is Professor of Christian Ethics at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California.

A Voice from the Other Side

JOSEF L. HROMADKA

I

SINCE several months, we are increasingly alarmed by the fact that the international tension has disturbingly affected both the Ecumenical movement, and the cooperation of the member churches with one another. The international situation is in itself destructive and goes beyond anything the Christian church has, in the last three or four centuries, been confronted with. It indicates that we are walking on the edge of a precipice. "We"—all over the world, not only in Europe or Asia. The slogans of "the world holocaust" or "the World Revolution" have been used with oratorical and theatrical gestures, the audiences have "enjoyed" the high-sounding phrases, got used to them, and overlooked the sinister fact that we have almost—almost—drifted into a full-fledged disintegration of "the world" as we have known it. The Christian civilization represented by the old "Christian" European and American nations has proved itself so incapable of coping with the tremendous issues of the postwar years that many of us are inclined to be more and more skeptical about its future. This is not to frighten or to pass judgment upon anybody. In spite of living within the orbit of "the East" I have not lost the feeling of solidarity with, and responsibility for the great Christian heritage carried by Western churches and nations. My words are dictated by a growing feeling of a catastrophical situation and the impotence of organized Christianity and official piety, exactly in the area of "Christian nations."

The danger that we might, one day, cease to understand one another has become, during the last two years, imminent: there exists an "iron curtain" between the churches of the two main sections of the present world. I am not ready to make anybody responsible for that, most unfortunate, situation. What I wish to stress is the disquieting self-assurance of very many, too many "western" churchmen and theologians that they are free of any self-imposed prejudice and that only "the other side" might be a victim of propaganda pressure, a police supervision, and of a systematic indoctrination. In spite of the growing separation from our sister-churches in the West we have an ample evidence of a sinister pressure to which our Western brethren are unconsciously and bona fide yielding. Let us not forget the subtle, imperceptible and intangible ways of the modern, highly organized world with its press, film and radio shaping not only the surface but also the depth of human mind. A pagan society with a "Christian" veneer and trapping is much more dangerous to a real freedom of faith than a society disclaiming any Christian interest and religious goal. A Christian, living in what you call the "Communist-dominated" country is, generally speaking, well aware of the pressure that springs from the present arena of his activity. His country is undergoing a profound change in its very structure. The forms of life are, from day to day, changing. The old character of a town, of a village, of a university is being radically transformed. The leadership of the public life has been taken over by a

class which hitherto was on the periphery of our society. The old ideological principles have been replaced by another (Marxist) way of thinking. Moreover, the international unrest with its imminent peril of a total war has intensified the vigilance of the men responsible not only for the new social structure, but for the new international order and the protection of world peace. The old way of life is gone and the new one is in the making. Only now, we have realized how closely the church was connected with the passing conventions and mentality, sentiments and prejudices.

We are aware of the impact of the revolutionary realities upon our life; many of us are increasingly alarmed by the fissures in the old church structure. We have come to see that the real church, established upon prophetic and apostolic foundations, has been buried under human accretions, forms, myths and sanctimonious superstitions which have nothing to do with the Gospel and which have, on account of their age, and human laziness and inertia, acquired a semi-divine authority. The pressure resulting from the new, non-normal (not abnormal) situation is evident, at times uncomfortable and irritating, but also liberating—making the air fresh and clear. Whereas the Christians in "Christian" countries, under political governments claiming their adherence to a Christian heritage, are often suffocating under public opinion, under at times decent, at times shameless, atmosphere of self-complacency and self-righteousness. They are suffocating and do not know about it. I am speaking in all frankness. Here is one of our common problems: are we capable of understanding one another, of listening to one another without prejudice and reservation? Are we ready to face the situation in all its brutal, unveiling, shattering aspects, without flattering and complimenting one another? Are we ready to acknowledge the present time as a time of judgment, of a terrible judgment also upon the Western church?

Recently I returned from a short visit to Hungary. My wife and I could see on the spot the way in which the Protestant churches carry on their witness and mission. The churches which were, five to six years ago, in a mortal danger (literally: in a mortal danger) are at present more vital and hopeful than any church I have seen in the West. I am sorry to speak that way. I do it for one simple reason: our average Christian in the West takes his freedom for granted just as he takes the enslavement of the church within the "Communist" area for granted. Today, however, nothing must be taken for granted, least of all the freedom of a church essentially and organically associated with the old moral, social and ecclesiastical forms of life. We, in the "East," have to rethink all our conventional ways of worship and action. We have to look for new channels of witness where we have discovered our "Christianity" to be irrelevant. We have to go far beyond the established forms of the Reformation churches and do away with all sentimentality, sanctimony and decorative religious mood. We have, above all, to take the tremendous up-

heaval of history seriously—regardless of our personal and social likes and dislikes. We have to understand the fact that in spite of all difficulties, and some “unpleasant” aspects of the new situation, the basis of the new social structure has amazingly broadened, that millions of working people, both in towns and villages, have come to a new sense of human dignity, that the old “liberal” era of ideological disintegration and of complacent skepticism is over, that we are standing at the beginning of something new—a classless society—and that the old way of life will never return. We cannot go back. Our problem is whether or not we have the real faith (faith, not religion!), whether or not we are strong enough to reinterpret and to relive the undiluted Gospel of the Old and New Testament, in a relevant way, within the framework of the new socialistic order. In a relevant way—this means in a way in which the church proves a creative factor in the personal and public life of our people. The church has her own substance and function which was given to her by her Lord. Our tremendous task is, humanly speaking, to liberate the church from all irrelevant trappings, to find under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, a word, reflecting the Word (of God) in view of the present human misery, to manifest the real substance of the church and to bring evidence to the fact that Jesus Christ has nothing to do with the religious opiate, that he is the Lord of truth and righteousness, of mercy and freedom. The biblical message is not identical with what we call “Christianity” and “Christian civilization.” It is not bound to the “Christian” nations. It is above them and beyond them. It resounds on the ruins of the old churches, and creates new armor and new instruments of the King of Kings. We are happy about any word of brotherly warning; we are aware of the perils within ourselves. But what we need from you is an attitude of understanding and trust. We may do many things contrary to the conventional pattern. But we pray to do it under the Word of the living God who may do wonderful things exactly where the Christians have least expected them.

II

Let me use this opportunity to say a word on the statement issued by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches in its Toronto session of July, 1950. We received it relatively late and read the authentic text of it only after the first controversies had resulted. My immediate feeling after I read the statement was that of a strange uneasiness. My foreboding that an irreparable error took place, has been deepened with the growing time-distance from the Toronto session. I wish to avoid any misunderstanding. It would be easy to condemn the decision of Toronto and to blame the members of the Central Committee for the lack of prudence and wisdom. However, that is not the point. The longer I analyze the statement the more I am incapable to grasp the fact that in the most decisive days of the present, the most responsible, and the most representative non-Roman Christian body could have passed such a resolution giving sanction to a military action which had been based on a very dubious evidence and on legally uncertain ground. Let us suppose (I

doubt it) that the evidence was basically correct and that the legal procedure of the Security Council of the U.N. was irreproachable. Even then, what a terrific pressure of a political hysteria and of petrified prejudices must have driven the churchmen present at the Central Committee meeting to commend the Korean “Police action.” It was a most unfortunate and fateful endorsement, the consequences of which no one of us can foresee. We cannot understand how the findings of the Korea commission representing exclusively one power-group within the U.N. could have prompted the Central Committee to take stand behind a measure which may, for centuries, compromise the cause of Christian civilization, if not the cause of the Church of Christ! In a tragically decisive moment of world history, the World Council of Churches identified itself (under most dubious circumstances) with one group of great powers, backed its military action, and encouraged all U.N. members to participate in it! Something terrible happened! Why?

The Korean “Police action” resulted from a violation of the U.N. Charter, of the unanimity of great powers. The Toronto statement cannot be justified on a legal ground although it claims to be based on a correct, unbiased objective finding. The Central Committee seems to have taken for granted the assumption almost generally accepted in certain Western circles that the unanimity principle is unworkable because it makes a quick decision and action impossible. But a responsible and realistic observer of the present world events cannot, in all sincerity and fairness, deny that the unanimity of the great powers still is, and in my judgment for a long time, will be, one of the pillars, not only of the U.N. but also of peace. The Central Committee should know it and warn the Western people against the demonic temptation of exploiting the prevalent majority of the Western group within the U.N. of throwing away what may be uncomfortable, but what, for the present moment, is indispensable for preserving the world peace. To our surprise, not a word of warning was uttered in the Toronto statement against the impatience with which the U.N. members had jettisoned one of the main rudiments of the international order instead of making an effort to penetrate, step by step, to the roots of the tragic events and to uncover the essential real ground of the present war danger. The most disastrous and perilous aspect of the present situation is the self-complacent assumption, obviously motivating the Toronto statement, that the real bete noir is Communism and its diabolic incarnation in the Soviet Union and that they (Communism and the Soviet Union) either fabricate revolutionary explosions or exploit the misery of the poor and resentments of subject peoples for their own sinister goals of tyranny and destruction. The Federal Council of Churches in the U.S.A. issued, on the World Order Day, October 22nd, 1950, a proclamation in which we read: “The Churches of Christ in America see in the aggressive imperialism of the police state the most virulent form of man’s disobedience to God. Communist leaders, in seeking world domination, appear to risk the catastrophe of another general war to achieve their ends. . . .” An outstanding American theologian came, in June, 1950, to Japan “with the solemn warning that the combination of Russian Nationalism

and Communist ideology has produced the most demonic force the world has known." (*Christianity and Crisis*, 1950, p. 117.) Quite recently, a high Lutheran churchman in Germany, whom I personally respect, criticized Karl Barth's attitude to the rearmament of Western Germany and wondered whether there is any difference between the Munich of 1938 and the Prague events of February, 1948. The former was, he said, a direct action, the latter was an indirect action. "This is the only difference." The bishop's implication was that the issue of Communism does not differ from the issue of Nazism and that a Christian cannot help dealing with both of them in the same way, on the same plane. I refer to these pronouncements not to make the World Council of Churches responsible for them. My point is that the Ecumenical Movement finds itself in a perilous position of being shaped by an interpretation of the present events which is essentially an echo of what any Western daily paper, any radio commentator and any average citizen says anyway. It is a negative attitude lacking sovereign insight of faith. I venture to say that a real Christian in the Eastern orbit is essentially more free than a Western highly educated and thoughtful theologian who may have been, by the "reactionaries" of his country, denounced because of his "progressive" stand, but who in the most decisive situation yielded to his formula of Russian nationalism and Communist ideology and gave blessing to the Korean "Police action." As long as the Western Christians adhere to their negative, cheap, and essentially self-complacent interpretation of what the Soviet Union and Communism mean they must fail exactly in a moment when a clear "prophetic" voice of the church is most needed. As long as they see in the Communist advance "an aggressive imperialism of the police state" they are hopelessly depriving themselves of any chance to be a warning voice on the edge of a precipice. "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" (I Cor. 14:8.) To a real battle, to the battle of the Lord. The public will tolerate any "progressive," critical manifesto of the church if it gives them in the end a word of consolation that "the most virulent form of man's disobedience to God" is on "the other side." It is a terrible theology. It is, as a wrong theology, a safeguard against both a sound political insight and a courageous political action. It is a theology of self-complacency and self-righteousness which blinds and deafens us in the moment of God's judgment. "We grope for the wall like the blind . . . we stumble at noonday as in the night." (Is. 59:10.) We grope as if we had no eyes to see that the accumulated wealth in one or two nations might be the most dangerous, although hidden motive of a political aggression as well as of our stubborn hostility to a social revolution that comes as a divine judgment upon selfishness, greediness, pride and complacency of nations. We stumble at noonday and commit (humanly speaking) irreparable blunders because we have failed to realize that an economic expansion is a very dangerous cause of war since it is less apparent than a political expansion. Every economic expansion tends, sooner or later, to result in a war. Is not the economic expansion of the Western world a breeding place of military aggression? Are we not in danger of concealing it from our-

selves because we are sure of our goodness and of the depravity—"of the most virulent form of man's disobedience to God," "the most demonic force the world has known"—of the other side? Do not misunderstand me! We, in the East, do not claim to be in every respect free. We are not ready to whitewash all that is going on around us. Our distress, however, arises from our sense of solidarity with, and responsibility for, the Christians all over the world, in general, and of the classical Christian nations, in particular. A great mission of the World Council of Churches is to stay as a living conscience of nations, to peer with the eyes of faith, into the depths of the world tragedy, of the social disease and of the imminent war catastrophe. The vast majority of the Christians organized in the World Council of Churches comes from the traditionally Christian countries, proud of their own Christian civilization and looking upon themselves as the defenders of Christian spiritual and moral treasures. It is exactly for this reason that they should carefully watch the motives of their own nations in the international field of politics. The living prophetic and apostolic word does not permit the church to pass judgment upon the world before she has bowed her head under the judgment of the Lord; she is not permitted to condemn other nations before she has most severely scrutinized the hearts and minds of her own nations. That applies particularly to the churches of the countries which ostentatiously and officially adhere to the principles of "Christian civilization." The church has right and obligation to raise her voice in the matters of public and international life. However, she must do it with the wisdom and prudence of a really penitent and to-Jesus-Christ-dedicated conscience. Today, when the peace of the world is at stake, when every self-righteous word can strengthen the aggressive and destructive forces of one's own nation and prompt a catastrophe on an unprecedented scale, an ecumenical church body should speak in a way that does not pour oil into the fire and does not encourage one side to a false and self-righteous "crusade."

Moreover, what we have missed in the Toronto statement was a clear and *specific* criticism of the Western policy. There was not one specific word of warning against the effort to deal with the Korean problem without New China and against the Soviet Union! Not one *specific* word of concern about the bloody suppression of the colonial peoples in Viet Nam and Malaya! Not one *specific* word of challenge to the incredible effort to keep the People's Government of China out of the United Nations! The Korean issue cannot be understood without the background of the whole of Asia and cannot be solved by an armed intervention of the Western nations. They have already lost, with the peoples of Asia, the moral prestige and the respect they once enjoyed. They have lost also the creative vision of the situation, of the present and of the future. Who can, in these days, fathom repercussions of the abysmal undertaking in Korea?

We expect from our Western friends a rigorous action for peace. They are suspicious of the World Congress of the Defenders of Peace, blaming it as belligerent and one-sided. We have no right to condemn them for their hesitation to join the Defenders of Peace—

we do not know whether they may have good reasons for their hesitation. But we have a right to ask why they have not started a parallel drive for peace, equally decisive, equally strong. Is the word "peace" Communist-dominated? Is it to be, for that very reason, avoided?

There are, in human history, times of profound change in the very foundations of the most sanctified institutions, and when a new, more righteous social order has to be adopted. Only a wisdom and an insight of faith can help the church and its members to see through the surface of events and to fathom what is the meaning of the present movement and what kind of action should be commended.

The Lameness of the Liberals

ROBERT E. FITCH

RECENT events make it clear that the liberals in the United States are in retreat on at least two fronts—the political and the academic. By liberals I mean in particular those who are devoted to the great civil liberties of freedom of speech, press, conscience, and assembly. Both in our government and in our schools and universities these liberals are under attack.

It is easy to single out the forces of fear, of reaction, and of hysteria which are behind this attack. But those of us who cherish the liberal tradition must be troubled by a deeper question. How can we account for the lameness of the liberals themselves? What is there to explain their sudden impotence and lack of unity before the foe?

In undertaking the unhappy task of this analysis, my attention will be focused on liberal politicians and on liberal professors—either jointly or in alternation. It is probable, however, that what I have to say about politicians and professors will apply in some measure also to theologians and moralists and business men in the liberal tradition. There seems to be a complex of factors involved:

(1) *Liberalism has been infected with skepticism and nihilism.* In its first phase liberalism was a faith; in its second phase it was a body of rational doctrine; in its present phase it is supported by neither faith nor reason. It has simply become a polite apologetic for anarchy. The belief in an objective truth or in an objective value has departed. Men still want to be free, but they do not really know what they should be free for.

(2) *The liberals have forgotten the limits of liberty.* This follows automatically from the previous proposition. The beginnings of this forgetfulness are to be found in John Stuart Mill. But the great fighting liberals—Roger Williams, John Locke, Voltaire—were never under the illusion that liberty had no limits whatsoever. The limits they respected were usually political in character, and need not be the limits for us today. At the very least, however, liberalism needs to be under the discipline of something like the Christian spirit and the scientific method. But when there are no objective value and no objective truth, that spirit and that method become irrelevant, and liberty becomes illimitable.

(3) *Liberalism has degenerated into atomistic individualism.* I don't know how many college professors I have heard argue that it is nobody's business if they belong to the Catholic Church or to the Communist Party, to the Ku Klux Klan or to the Holy Rollers, whether they vote for Gerald L. K. Smith or for Senator Taft. This, they allege, is to impute "guilt by association." They want to be judged on their individual merits. But men always have been judged by their associations and always will be. Whenever we deliberately and voluntarily commit ourselves to a social group, we must expect that others will infer that "birds of a feather flock together."

(4) *Too many liberal professions tend to divorce craftsmanship from character.* Both the politician and the professor are guilty of this. The politician who is a master of the mechanics of his trade forgets the high ideals which it ought to serve. The professor who has achieved a high competence in scholarship forgets the social and ethical values which, as a teacher, he must mediate to his pupils. Unlike lawyers, doctors, and clergymen, these two professions are unique in having no explicit code of professional ethics, and in making no effort, as professional bodies, to enforce such a code upon their membership.

(5) *Too many liberals tend to view themselves as a privileged caste.* The only legitimate distinctions of caste rest on principle and on social function, never on pure privilege. The economic liberals, the capitalists, have often been guilty of forgetting their functions and thinking of themselves as a privileged élite. The academic liberals, the professors, are too often guilty of regarding themselves as an intellectual aristocracy, immune from the ordinary responsibilities and restrictions of citizenship. But a democracy cannot tolerate privilege, and it will rise against the arrogance of any class—even an élite of labor leaders.

(6) *The liberals have fallen out among themselves.* An ironical feature of American society today is the way one group of liberals will shout for its own liberties while seeking to curtail the liberties of a second group; and the second group will vaunt its liberties while trying to destroy the liberties of the first group. Thus business men want unlimited free enterprise for themselves, but are willing to curtail the freedom of college professors; and college professors will press for their own sacred liberties, but are happy to devise schemes for restricting the liberties of business men. I am not quite sure that the liberties of man are all of one piece. But I am quite sure that if some measure of liberty is important to the successful functioning of one significant enterprise, then it is equally important to the successful functioning of another kind of significant enterprise.

(7) *Liberalism has lost its roots and its reasons.* Perhaps this repeats the first point about the infection of liberalism by skepticism. But what needs to be made explicit here is that our specific liberties—personal, political, civil, and economic—have their roots in the conception of spiritual liberty, and are entangled in the whole religious concept of the sanctity of the person before God. The fact is that liberalism is the secular off-shoot of the Hebrew-Christian-Protestant tradition in ethics. When it loses its connections with its roots,

then it loses its very reason for being, and also loses the vitality of its being.

(8) *The actual values of too many liberals are the values of Mammon.* The god Mammon makes cowards of us all. When men care more about security than about adventure—and security is the fetish of our whole society—they no longer have any use for the perils and the rewards of liberty. When what matters most of all is holding onto one's job, maintaining social prestige, protecting a standard of living, getting ahead in the world, being comfortable and content and safe, then neither professors, nor politicians—nor business men, for that matter—will have the heart to accept the risk and the hazard, to undergo the toil and the sacrifice, to protect their precious freedoms.

(9) *The liberals have forgotten how to fight.* This proposition, following the two previous ones, is a kind of conclusion to the premises of a syllogism. Anyway, the fact is there—that in the twentieth century, unlike the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, liberalism is no longer a fighting faith. When men no longer know why or for what they ought to be free, they will not be disposed to fight for freedom. When men care more for other values than they care for liberty—when they cherish comfort and security above all else—they will be cowards to the enemy and cadts to their own comrades.

(10) *The latter-day liberals are tainted with self-righteousness.* The liberals are no longer the righteous. They are simply the self-righteous. This is the final irony. For they have probably done as much themselves to destroy their liberties as have all the hosts of the enemy together. In their skepticism and nihilism they have cut out the very foundations of their faith. In

their forgetfulness of the limits of liberty, they have often been the most determined to welcome, in the name of liberty, those who would annihilate all liberty. In their atomistic individualism and in their pride of caste, they have made men wonder whether their liberties could have any regard for the welfare of society as a whole. In their falling out with one another, they have fought the battle of the enemy for him. In their preference for comfort and security over the liberty which they extol, they have shown that they are unworthy of the heritage of which they boast. And in their cowardice in the fight, they have brought themselves into contempt before all men. Yet even in their own betrayal of their own cause, they ascribe to themselves the righteousness which can belong only to the cause itself, and which has long since departed from their own persons.

To some readers this analysis may appear to be pessimistic to the point of making the whole struggle a futile one. But the energies of a Christian do not falter nor fail for all that. There is still the truly righteous remnant; and it is still the case that one prophet of the Lord is worth four hundred and fifty priests of Baal. At the very worst one would rather perish in the company of fools and weaklings who yet fly the banners of freedom, than prosper for the moment in the company of the wise and the powerful whose congregation is in the courts of Satan. At the best we may remember the words of one who cherished the spiritual roots of liberty even though he was offended by its secular fruits, and fight on in the faith that, in spite of human folly and frailty, "God's truth abideth still, His kingdom is forever!"

The World Church: News and Notes

Bishop Dibelius, in London Address, Rejects Pacifism

Bishop Otto Dibelius of Berlin, in an address at Westminster Abbey, London, rejected the pacifist solution to international problems.

The head of the Evangelical Church in Germany declared that the Christian faith does not contradict the efforts of a government to prepare for the defense of its people against an aggressor. "A government would be guilty of irresponsibility if it left its people without protection," he said.

At the same time, Bishop Dibelius said that Christians must resist the idea that war is inevitable.

The bishop, who spoke under the auspices of the British Council of Churches, acknowledged that it was sometimes hard to say whether the strengthening of defenses aided the cause of peace or hastened a new war. He added, however, that the answer to this question was the responsibility of statesmen and not of the Church.

"In one point the Church is sure of its political judgment," Dr. Dibelius said. "We can say with all clearness and certainty that a so-called preventive war is against God's Word and command. He who fires the

first shot proclaims himself the aggressor. He is the guilty party, and has to be treated as such."

The bishop charged that the Communists were the chief propagators of the idea that war is inevitable.

"They teach," he said, "that a classless society can be attained in no other way than by force. As Christians, we believe this to be the most dangerous teaching of our time."

Bishop Dibelius called on the church to bring all nations together by cultivating friendly understanding among them.

"We in Germany see how important this is," he said. "Where an iron curtain has been drawn across the border and the people are forcibly prevented from meeting together, they begin as a matter of course to talk different languages. They do not understand each other any longer, and finally believe that their own side is populated by angels, and the other side by devils."

Only the church can avert the danger of hatred leading to war, he said. He pointed to the "unbroken contacts and fellowship" maintained between Christians of enemy nations during World War II, and said that "in the cold war today, the Christian Church is the only great power extending over all iron curtains and Chinese

MAR 26 1951

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

M. SEARLE BATES	F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOHN C. BENNETT	LISTON POPE
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Secretary</i>	

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
CHARLES W. GILKEY	JOHN A. MACKAY
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
UMPHREY LEE	FRANCIS P. MILLER
	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS	

walls—a power of reconciliation among men and nations.”

Bishop Dibelius’ message was seconded by Dr. Cyril Forster Garbett, Archbishop of York, who said that Christians should encourage and support all attempts to negotiate and to “penetrate the iron curtain of ignorance and misunderstanding now dividing the world.”

Dr. Garbett asserted that righteousness should come before peace, and that there was little hope of preserving peace unless the Western democracies were sufficiently armed.

“A State which now refuses to arm is committing suicide,” he stated.

He stressed, however, that rearmament should never be used for purposes of aggression, and unreservedly condemned preventive wars. Use of the atomic bomb in a preventive war, he said, would be “adding crime to crime.” He urged that no nation should enter war

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving
5201 Woodward
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-52

except with the approval and support of the United Nations.—*Religious News Service*.

German Churches Provide Aid For East and West Zone Students

German Evangelical Churches granted emergency scholarship aid and loans to 1,562 university students within Germany during the 1950 summer semester, a report issued by *Hilfswerk*, official united German Protestant relief agency, discloses. Each student received a monthly average of slightly less than \$10. This involved an expenditure of nearly a quarter of a million German marks (DM 247,000, or about \$61,000), most of which came from German churches and church-related agencies.

A large number of students, especially those coming from the East Zone, found it necessary to take extra jobs in order to remain in school.

Of these 685 Eastern students, 362 were attending schools within the East Zone, while 323 others received their training at universities in West Germany. Most of those receiving this help were theological students.—*Ecumenical Press Service*, Geneva.

World Council Group Wants China in UN

In a special “message to the nation,” the Australian Committee for the World Council of Churches, meeting in Sydney, said it favored admitting Communist China to the United Nations, “because international justice demands such a step.”

The Committee also endorsed the British government’s stand against re-crossing the 38th Parallel in Korea by United Nations forces until after “the fullest consultation with U.N. members and further patient attempts at negotiation.”

Anglican Bishop Ernest H. Burgmann of Canberra and Goulburn told the Committee that John Foster Dulles, President Truman’s special envoy to Japan, is, in many ways, “a dangerous man.”

The bishop said that “probably Dulles is an honest Christian, but we don’t want to commit the World Council to anything he does.”

“Nor,” he added, “should we commit this body to anything in the way of American international politics, or we will get our fingers burned.”

Mr. Dulles, a prominent Protestant layman, is a member of the Church Commission on International Affairs, a joint agency of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council.—*Religious News Service*.

Haddam House Offers Popular Editions

“To secure even wider distribution for books that help Christians to count in these times,” Haddam House Publications (Association Press, 347 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.) is reprinting recent “basic religious literature” in soft-cover editions to be sold at 59c. First two volumes offered are *Primer for Protestants*, by James Hastings Nichols, and *Christian Faith and My Job*, by Alexander Miller.—*Ecumenical Press Service*, New York.